

<b>Interview Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/863,299	SASAKI, TOYONORI	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Michael P Nghiem	2861	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Michael P Nghiem. (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
 (2) Scott Shulte. (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 06 August 2002.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 46-68.

Identification of prior art discussed: Shinada ('158), Suzuki ('207), Takagi ('794).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: \_\_\_\_\_

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

- ① Applicants will amend cl. 66 to overcome 112 rejection and will explain amendment in remarks
  - ② Applicants argue that prior art does not teach filling ink through the ink filling holes such that ink is filled in the first chamber through the second chamber (cls. 1, 62)
  - ③ Applicants argue that prior art does not teach an atmosphere connection path in relation with the partition wall as claimed (cl. 53)
  - ④ Applicants argue that prior art does not teach a second partition for separating
- Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.
- \_\_\_\_\_  
 Examiner's signature, if required

The cartridge into a first chamber and atmosphere path and the relationship between the first, second chambers and atmosphere path. Examiner will reconsider Applicants arguments and make search.